

**REMARKS**

This Reply and Amendment is intended to be completely responsive to the non-final Office Action dated August 9, 2005. Claims 1-100 are pending in this Application. Claims 1-19, 32-49 and 73-90 are withdrawn. Original Claims 64-72 were previously cancelled without prejudice to further prosecution on the merits, and original Claims 50-63 are also now cancelled without prejudice to further prosecution on the merits. Claims 20-31 stand rejected. Independent Claim 20 has been amended and new Claims 91-100 have been added.

**Allowable Subject Matter/New Claims**

On page 5 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner stated that "Claims 25-30 [are] objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims."

Dependent Claim 25 depends from independent (base) Claim 20. The Applicants have added new independent Claim 91, which includes a combination of subject matter from original independent Claim 20 and dependent Claim 25, in order to expedite the issuance of allowable claims. New dependent Claims 92-95 depend from independent Claim 91 and have been added to provide claims of varying scope.

Dependent Claim 30 depends from independent (base) Claim 20. The Applicants have added new independent Claim 96, which includes a combination of subject matter from original independent Claim 20 and dependent Claim 30, in order to expedite the issuance of allowable claims. New dependent Claims 97-100 depend from independent Claim 96 and have been added to provide claims of varying scope.

Accordingly, the Applicants believe that new Claims 91-100 recite a combination of subject matter believed to be allowable. The Applicants respectfully request allowance of new Claims 91-100.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

On page 2 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 20 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,139,163 issued to Satoh et al.

Claim 20 is in independent form. Independent Claim 20 (as amended) now recites a “method of making a display device” comprising, in combination with other elements, the step of “coupling at least one LED to the conductive layer so that light emitted from the LED is directed outwardly from the aperture.” In contrast, Satoh et al. describes a “light leading plate 12 [that] has a light discharge surface 12a, a light diffusing plane 12b, and a V-shaped reflecting side 12c” (see col. 2, lines 39-43). A “display device” in which “light emitted from the LED is directed outwardly from the aperture” as required by independent Claim 20 (as amended) is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Satoh et al.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and allowance of independent Claim 20 (as amended) and dependent Claims 25-31 as they depend from independent Claim 20.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

On pages 3-4 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Satoh et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,179 issued to Youngquist and/or U.S. Patent No. 6,692,137 issued to Blanchard.

Dependent Claims 21-24 depend from independent Claim 20 (as amended). As previously described, the Applicants have amended independent Claim 20 to recite a combination of subject matter the Applicants believe to be allowable.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome and dependent Claims 21-24 as they depend from independent Claim 20, are now allowable. See 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of dependent Claims 21-24.


\* \* \*

Original Claims 50-63 are now cancelled without prejudice to further prosecution on the merits. Independent Claim 20 has been amended and new Claims 91-100 have been added. The Applicants submit that the Application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request allowance of Claims 20-31 and 91-100.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present Application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, the Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date SEPTEMBER 14, 2005 By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 26371  
Telephone: (414) 297-5591  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

John M. Lazards  
Attorney for the Applicants  
Registration No. 48,367